

Appln No. 09/995,483

Amdt dat January 30, 2004

Reply to Office action of October 30, 2003

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The above amendments and these remarks are responsive to the Office Action mailed on October 30, 2003. Claims 18, 22, 23, 25-27, 28, 48 and 49 have been amended. Specifically, claims 22, 23 and 25 have been amended for clarity. Claims 2, 43-47 and 50-56 have been canceled. Claims 58-81 have been added. Claims 1, 3-42, 48, 49 and 57-81 are now pending in this application. Reconsideration on the basis of the above amendments and remarks below is kindly requested.

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) in that the features of claim 1 and claim 2 were not disclosed. Claim 2 has been canceled. According to the Examiner, the feature of "at least one slot formed across each of said plurality of ridges" in claim 1 was not disclosed in the drawings. Figures 4 and 5 of this application disclose this feature. As such, applicant submits that the objection to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83 should now be withdrawn.

The Examiner objected to claims 22, 50 and 54. Claims 50 and 54 have been canceled. Claim 22 has been amended to overcome this objection.

The Examiner rejected claim 2 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph. Claim 2 has been canceled.

The Examiner rejected claim 23 and 25 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claims 23 and 25 have been amended to require that liquid is forced in the slot (claim 22) or in the groove (claim 25) after venting. Moreover, according to the Examiner, the claim language is such that an action is taken to cause some solidification whereas in the

Appln No. 09/995,483

Amdt date January 30, 2004

Reply to Office action of October 30, 2003

specification it is stated that the liquid in the slot or the grooves is allowed to solidify. As described in the specification, the action taken is the action of letting the liquid solidify. As such, applicant submits that the rejections to claims 23 and 25 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph have been overcome.

The Examiner objected to claims 18-34 under 35 USC §251 as being an improper capture of the broadened claim subject matter. Applicant believes that the Examiner meant to reject claims 18-21. Claim 18 has been amended by adding the limitation "outwardly" which was deleted in the amendment mailed on August 15, 2003. As such, applicant submits that the rejections to claims 18-34 under 35 USC §251 have now been overcome.

The Examiner rejected claims 43-47 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Kitterman and claims 50-56 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitterman. Claims 43-47 and 50-56 have been canceled.

The Examiner rejected claims 26 and 30 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gora, U.S. Patent No. 2,739,724 in view of Simard, U.S. Patent No. 4,896,781 or Moller, U.S. Patent No. 3,704,677. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 26 is directed to a vented bottle cap system comprising a disc having a circular ridge and a slot formed across the ridge. The claim further requires that "the slots form pathways for any gas generated in the bottle to escape across the bottleneck rim". Gora discloses a cap having a ridge 28 having a slot 29 formed at the periphery of the ridge. The slot 29 does not allow any gas generated in the bottle to escape. Rather, only gas with

Appln No. 09/995,483

Amdt dat January 30, 2004

Reply to Office action of October 30, 2003

sufficient pressure is allowed to escape through slot 29. Furthermore, neither Gora nor Simard nor Moller disclose, teach or suggest a disc having a circular ridge, having a plurality of slots formed across the ridge. As such, applicant submits the rejection to claim 26 under 35 USC §103(a) has been overcome.

It should be noted that claims 27 and 29 have been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of their base claim and any intervening claims and as such should now be in condition for allowance. Claim 30 has been amended to be dependent from claim 27. Claim 27 is now believed to be in condition for allowance. As such, applicant submits that claim 30 is also in condition for allowance as being dependent from an allowable base claim and for the additional limitations it contains therein.

Claims 58-81 have been added and are directed to subject matter disclosed in the application as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

It should be pointed out that amended claim 18 finds support on column 3, line 3 to column 4, line 27. Amended claims 23 and 25 find support on column 4, lines 28-39. Amended claim 26, finds support in column 3, lines 23-36. Amended claims 27, 29 and 30 find support on column 3, line 3 to column 5, line 52 and on claims 27, 29, and 30, respectively as issued. Amended claim 30 finds support on column 4, lines 54-61. Claims 58 and 59 find support on column 4, lines 10-15. Claims 60, 63, 67, 69, and 73-78 find support on column 3, lines 37-63. Claims 61-62, 64, 68 and 70 find support on column 5, lines 38-45. Claim 71 find support on column 5, lines 8-11. Claim 72 finds

Appln No. 09/995,483

Amdt dat January 30, 2004

Reply to Offic action of October 30, 2003

support on column 5, lines 25-34. Claims 78-81 find support on column 3, lines 3-63.

The rejections and objections to all claims pending in this application are believed to have been overcome that this application is now believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any remaining questions or concerns about the allowability of this application, the Examiner is kindly requested to call the undersigned attorney to discuss them.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTIE PARKER & HALE, LLP

By 

Constantine Marantidis

Reg. No. 39,759

626/795-9900

CM/cmt

CMT PAS542540.1-*--01/30/04 10:50 AM